



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/778,788 | 02/08/2001 | Chuan-Cheng Chiu | 4425-117 | 5857 |

2292 7590 07/08/2004

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2178

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/778,788

Applicant(s)

CHIU ET AL.

Examiner

Jonathan D. Schlaifer

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application 09//778,788 filed on 2/8/2001, with no prior art filed.
2. Claims 1-19 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krane (USPN 5,799,063—filing date 8/15/1996).**
4. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Krane discloses in col. 2, lines 30-41 a method for browsing on-line using numeric keys (links can be selected using a telephone keypad), said method comprising: sorting a plurality of hyperlinks displayed on a web page; (this step is inherent to the displaying of the links in a browser); marking each said plurality of hyperlinks with a corresponding number (this would be inherent to allowing selection via a numeric pad, since there are “access names” as in col. 2, line 36) and connecting to and displaying another web page linked with the hyperlink in response to an input number (the links can be selected and followed via a telephone keypad).
5. **Regarding independent claim 10**, it is a system that carries out the method of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, further in view of Chen et al. (USPN 4,173,832—filing date 3/15/1978), hereinafter Chen.**
7. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Krane fails to disclose a method wherein said marked numbers alternate from being hidden to being displayed in response to a function key. However, Chen, in col. 5, lines 8-20, describes selective hiding of information in response to a push button in order to provide helpful visual feedback to a user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used selective hiding of information in response to a push button in order to have provided helpful visual feedback to a user in the manner of Chen in the context of Krane.
8. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 2 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
9. **Claim 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, further in view of Chen, further in view of Slotznick (USPN 6,011,537—filing date 1/27/1998).**

10. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Krane and Chen fail to disclose a method wherein said input number is used to activate the connection of the hyperlinks only when said marked numbers are displayed. However, Slotznick in col. 3, lines 48-67 discloses how hidden hyperlinks cannot be activated in order to permit complete loading of a page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prevent activation of hidden hyperlinks in order to permit complete loading of a page.
11. **Regarding dependent claim 16**, it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 3 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
12. **Claims 4-5 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, further in view of Beyda et al. (USPN 6,004,326—filing date 5/12/1997), hereinafter Beyda.**
13. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Krane fails to disclose a method wherein range of said marked numbers is less than a predetermined number. However, Beyda, in the Abstract, lines 1-15 reveals that a predetermined range is used to determine if hyperlinks are activated in an appropriate manner. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a predetermined range in the manner of Beyda in order to determine if hyperlinks are activated in an appropriate manner.
14. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Krane and Beyda fail to explicitly disclose that said predetermined number is 100. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that two digits is a manageable number of digits to work with. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to have the predetermined number be 100 because it would have led to the marked numbers being 2 digits in length, which is a manageable number.

15. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 4 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
16. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, it modifies claim 13 in the manner in which claim 5 modifies claim 4 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
17. **Claims 6-7, 9, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, further in view of D'Amico et al. (USPN 4,168,399—filing date 5/5/1978), hereinafter D'Amico.**
18. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Krane fails to disclose a method wherein a key of an input device is pushed twice within a predetermined time to represent tens of said input number. However, in col. 5, lines 24-67 and col. 6, lines 1-21 D'Amico discloses pressing keys multiple times with delay to represent successive digits of a number in a user-friendly manner. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow pressing keys multiple times with delay to represent successive digits of a number in a user-friendly manner in the manner of D'Amico in the context of Krane.
19. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Krane fails to disclose that the predetermined time is 0.5 second. However, the predetermined time of D'Amico is 0.5 second, which may be combined with Krane as in claim 6. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to to allow pressing keys multiple times with delay of 0.5 second to represent successive

Art Unit: 2178

digits of a number in a user-friendly manner in the manner of D'Amico in the context of Krane.

20. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, Krane and D'Amico fail to disclose that said input device is a remote controller. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that remote controllers can be used to allow user-friendly input at a distance. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a remote controller with Krane and D'Amico in order to allow user-friendly input at a distance.
21. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 6 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
22. **Regarding dependent claim 18**, it modifies claim 17 in the manner in which claim 7 modifies claim 6 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
23. **Claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane, further in view of Kuzma (USPN 5,832,506—filing date 3/29/1996).**
24. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, Krane fails to disclose a method further comprising sorting and marking at least one defined function displayed on the web page, so that the defined function is activated in response to the corresponding input number. However, in col. 4, lines 66-67 and col. 5, lines 1-7, Kuzma discloses linking functions to links in order to imbue them with additional capabilities. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to link functions with links in the context of Krane in the manner of Kuzma in order to imbue them with additional capabilities.

Art Unit: 2178

25. **Regarding dependent claim 19**, it modifies claim 10 in the manner in which claim 8 modifies claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
26. **Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krane.**
27. **Regarding dependent claim 11**, it modifies claim 10 in that manner in which claim 9 modifies claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.
28. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, Krane fails to disclose that the network device is a set-top box. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that set-top boxes were convenient, widely available network devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a set-top box in conjunction with Krane's invention because it would have been a convenient, widely available network device.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 5,903,632 (filing date 3/19/1997)—Brandon

USPN 6,028,600 (filing date 6/2/1997)—Rosin et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is 703-305-9777. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS



**STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER**